

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

Kevin Bradley,

Case No. 1:21-cv-1274

Petitioner,

v.

ORDER

Tom Watson, Warden,

Respondent.

Before me is the June 7, 2023 Report and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge James E. Grimes, Jr., recommending I deny *pro se* Petitioner<sup>1</sup> Kevin Bradley's petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 because Bradley's grounds for relief are procedurally defaulted, not cognizable in habeas proceedings, or meritless. (Doc. No. 15).

Under the relevant statute, "[w]ithin fourteen days after being served with a copy, any party may serve and file written objections to such proposed findings and recommendations as provided by rules of court." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949 (6th Cir. 1981). The deadline to file objections initially was June 21, 2023. I subsequently granted Bradley's motion for an extension of that deadline and set the new deadline as July 28, 2023. (Doc. No. 17). The petitioner has not filed any objections and that deadline has passed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bradley is incarcerated at the North Central Correctional Complex in Marion, Ohio, where Tom Watson currently is the Warden. The Clerk of Court is ordered to substitute Watson as the Respondent in this case. Fed. R. Civ. P. 25(d).

The failure to file written objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation constitutes a waiver of a determination by the district court of an issue covered in the report.

*Thomas v. Arn*, 728 F.2d 813, 815 (6th Cir. 1984), *aff'd*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *see also Walters*, 638 F.2d at 950; *Smith v. Detroit Fed'n of Teachers, Local 231*, 829 F.2d 1370, 1373 (6th Cir. 1987) (“[O]nly those specific objections to the magistrate’s report made to the district court will be preserved for appellate review”).

Following my review of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation, I accept Judge Grimes’ recommendation and deny Bradley’s petition. (Doc. No. 1). Further, I certify there is no basis on which to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253; Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

So Ordered.

s/ Jeffrey J. Helmick  
United States District Judge